

Claim 17 is limited to the combination of a bow, a bow string, and a silencer assembled to the bow string. The claim further requires that the silencer be an elongated strip of elastomeric material and that there be a single overhand knot in the silencer which completely surrounds the bow string and attaches the silencer to that element of the claimed combination.

The Tilby silencer is fabricated from a "soft, resilient fabric", not an elastomeric material; and that silencer is not attached to the associated bow string by a single overhand knot which is tied in the silencer and extends around the entire circumference of the bow string (see Figs. 4-9 of the Tilby drawings).

Archery Magazine is likewise not relevant to the patentability of claim 17. That reference discloses a string silencer composed of: "strong rubber 'whiskers'", not the single elastomeric strip type of silencer called for in claim 17.

Newly-presented independent claim 18 replaces original claim 5. The latter claim was rejected as anticipated by Tilby. The newly-presented claim is considered clearly patentable over that reference which does not in any way disclose or make obvious a bow string silencer with the specific configuration required in claim 18; viz., one with a center segment and first and second arms which are integrally formed at opposite ends of the center segment and, at rest, extend in opposite directions and at equal angles from the center segment. The "legs 42, 44" of the Tilby silencer extend in the same direction as that silencer's "body portion" or center segment 46, not at angles to that segment. The difference is patentably significant; the legs of the Tilby silencer, even if they were not knotted around a bow string, would not be capable of assuming the claimed relative orientations as shown in Figs. 10 and 11 of the drawings.

Newly-presented claim 22, which replaces original claim 12, was also rejected as anticipated by Tilby. Claim 12 includes limitations like those just discussed in conjunction with

claim 18. Such limitations are considered to patentably distinguish the invention defined in claim 22 from anything disclosed in or made obvious by Tilby.

Finally, as far as the rejected claims are concerned, newly-presented, independent claim 24 replaces original claim 14, again rejected as anticipated by Tilby. Claim 24 includes limitations like those discussed above in conjunction with claim 17. Those limitations are considered to clearly distinguish applicant's invention as defined in claim 24 from anything disclosed in or made obvious by Tilby.

Cited, but not applied by the Examiner, was Huddlestone patent No. 4,023,551. It is not believed that Huddlestone is pertinent to the patentability of the claims now pending in this application by virtue of its disclosing only a silencer which is attached by threading a bow string through apertures spaced at intervals along the silencer. In contrast, all of the now-pending claims are limited to silencers which are knotted around a bow string or installed between the elements of a split bow string.

It is respectfully requested that the following items of prior art, all U.S. Patents, be made of record in this application:

<u>Patent Number</u>	<u>Patentee(s)</u>	<u>Issue Date</u>
3059629	Stinson	23 Oct. 1962
3612029	Carroll	12 Oct. 1971
3756214	Christen	4 Sept. 1973
3837327	Saunders et al.	24 Sept. 1974
4080951	Bateman, III	28 Mar. 1978

Stinson (3059629) and Christen (3756214) disclose geometrically complicated bow string silencers quite unlike any encompassed by the pending claims of the present application.

Carroll (3612029) and Bateman III (4080951) disclose variations on the conventional, cat-whisker type of bow string silencer. It is believed abundantly clear from what is discussed above that the presently pending claims are limited to bow string silencers quite different than those of the cat-whisker type.

Saunders et al. (3837327) discloses a bow string silencer which is: "a spirally-wound, spring-like coiled ribbon encircling and carried by a bow string . . . ." Again, this is something quite different than is called for in the presently pending claims of this application.

Copies of the just-discussed items of prior art are attached as is an appropriately completed PTO Form 1449.

For the reasons discussed in detail above, favorable reconsideration of this application is believed to be in order and is accordingly solicited.

SIGNED at Seattle, Washington, this 23<sup>d</sup> day of October, 2000.

Respectfully Submitted

STEVEN C. SIMS

By: Richard D. Multer  
Richard D. Multer  
Registration No. 20661  
MILLER NASH LLP  
4400 Two Union Square  
601 Union Street  
Seattle WA 98101  
Tel.: (206) 622-8484  
Fax: (206) 622-7485